

REMARKS

Claims 26-30 have been added. Claims 5, 9, 12, 20 and 23 have been amended. Claims 1-4, 16-19, 24 and 25 have been cancelled. Therefore, claims 5-15, 20-30 are presented for further examination.

In the Advisory Action dated September 10, 2008, the Examiner indicated that the previously filed amendments would not be entered because they raise new issues and would require reconsideration. Applicants respectfully assert that the amendments and arguments provided in the instant response overcome the Examiner's rejections, and thus, the pending claims of the present application are allowable. Reconsideration of the instant patent application is respectfully requested of the Examiner in view of the amendments and remarks set forth below.

Claim Rejections 35 USC §102

Claims 5-15 and 12-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,926,544 (*Zhou*). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Examiner makes the same rejection that was made and retracted nearly four years ago by the previous Examiner (Jeffery Harold). Like Examiner Singh now argues, Examiner Harold argued in 2004 that *Zhou* anticipates claims 5-15 and 12-23. *See* Office Action, June 9, 2004. The Applicants pointed out (for reasons once again explained below) to Examiner Harold that *Zhou* was not an anticipating reference. *See* Response, 7-30-2004. After thoroughly considering the Applicants' arguments, Examiner Harold correctly acknowledged in a May 2, 2005 Office Action that the pending claims were, in fact, allowable over *Zhou*. Instead of rehashing arguments that have been previously advanced and withdrawn by Examiner Harold, Applicants respectfully urge Examiner Singh to allow the pending claims.

Claim 5 is directed to a method for DC feed control for a line card. The method comprises determining if the line card is operating in a current limit region of a DC feed curve; synthesizing a curve in the current limit region of the DC feed curve; determining a loop voltage based on the synthesized curve; and applying the loop voltage to the subscriber line.

The Examiner argues that *Zhou* anticipates claim 5. The Applicants respectfully disagree, and assert that *Zhou* at least does not teach synthesizing a curve in the current limit region of the DC feed curve, wherein the synthesized curve is a linear curve with a negative slope. As shown, for example, in Figure 4 of the patent application, a linear synthesized curve 405 having a negative slope is, for reasons apparent from the patent application, effectively used to address a saturation condition. This “synthesized” curve is calculated, in one embodiment, using the method described in Figure 6 of the present application.

In contrast to Figure 4, Figure 3 of the patent application shows a traditional DC feed curve employed by conventional line cards for DC feed control. The system described in *Zhou* also uses this type of DC feed curve, as shown in Figure 4 of *Zhou*. As can be seen in Figure 4 of *Zhou*, there is no synthesization of a curve in the current limit region; instead, *Zhou* describes that curve 408 is used to determine the operating point. See *Zhou*, 5:47-50 (stating that the line card 308 maintains DC battery feed operating point at the intersection of the load line 406 and curve 408). And, as shown, in Figure 4 of *Zhou*, the curve in the current limit region is neither (1) synthesized nor (2) linear with a negative slope. To the contrary, the curve is a vertical line, with infinite slope, much like a curve used by conventional systems.

The text relied upon by the Examiner, namely the text between col. 4, line 64 and col. 6, line 28, does not describe the “synthesizing a curve” feature of claim 5. Rather, the cited text generally describes the graph of Figure 4, and the general operation of the device in Figure 3.

Additionally, the cited text also does not teach or disclose determining a loop voltage based on the synthesized curve or applying the loop voltage (which is calculated based on the synthesized curve) to the subscriber line. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, independent claim 5, and its dependent claims, is allowable. Moreover, independent claims 9, 12, 20, and 23 also call for the “synthesization” feature that is completely missing from *Zhou*. As such, these claims, and the claims depending therefrom, are also allowable for at least this reason.

Newly added claims (claims 26-30), which depend from their respective independent claims, are further allowable in view of the features recited therein.

In view of reasons presented above, the pending claims are allowable. As such, reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Houston, Texas telephone number (713) 934-4064 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

WILLIAMS, MORGAN & AMERSON, P.C.
CUSTOMER NO. 23720

Date: October 16, 2008

By: /Ruben S. Bains/
Ruben S. Bains
Reg. No. 46,532
10333 Richmond, Suite 1100
Houston, Texas 77042
(713) 934-4064
(713) 934-7011 (facsimile)
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)